



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,789	06/29/2001	Marcos Nogucira Novaes	YOR920010315US1	4577
48150	7590	12/07/2006	EXAMINER	
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817				LY, ANH
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2162		

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	09/893,789	Applicant(s) NOVAES, MARCOS NOGUEIRA
Examiner Anh Ly	Art Unit 2162	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 29 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
**JOHN BREENE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicants argued that, "The Examination Guidelines state that ... It is noted that the Guidelines do not constitute substantive rulemaking and hence do not have the force and effect of law." (page 6, lines 10-14).

The Guidelines have been incorporated into the MPEP-2106.

Claims 2-17, 22, 24-39, 44, 45 and 47-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the bodies of independent claims of those claims in view of MPEP 2106 (IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii) sections are non statutory because they are lacking of real world useful result. They are missing the steps or processes producing any useful result to the invention, of having a utility to convey the final result achieved by the claimed invention, that is, they are not producing a result tied to the real/physical world or this application is not a practical application.

The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or act to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material per se, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in Benson were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

All claims have abstract idea, perform mathematical algorithm processes. These are non-statutory subject matters. (see MPEP 2106.02)

Applicants argued that, "claim 17, selectively traversable by using hypertext links and by not using hypertext links.

The claim contains subject matter, which does not enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. "by using hypertext links and by not using hypertext links."

Applicants argued that, "it would not have been obvious to combine Fox and Egendorf." (page 20, lines 8-10; page 23, lines 1-8 and page 24, lines 1-6).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Fox and Egendorf are from the same field of endeavor and both are directed to searching/retrieving relevant document and closer or affinity of words in the documents (Fox's abstract and section 0059, Egendorf's 0011-0014, 0026 & 0240). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to combine the teachings of Fox and Egendorf because it motivated to utilize the use of traveling or traversing information to find out an affinity group the affinity as disclosed (Egendorf's section 0036 and 0060), into the system of Fox for the purpose of searching for information in a plurality of information sources and searching databases on the Internet, thereby, solving the problem of finding current information in an increasingly broad, large scale in the Internet network (Egendorf's sections 0001-0002 and 0052). Moreover, the examiner kindly submits that the applicants misread the applicable references used in the last office action. However, when read and analyzed in light of the specification, the invention as claimed does not support applicant's assertions. Actually, applicants are interpreting the claims very narrow without considering the broad teaching of the references used in the rejections. Additionally, it is important to note that the examiner interpretation of the claims, wherein, the examiner explicitly stated passages in the cited references which were not even addressed. The aforementioned assertion wherein all the limitations are not taught or suggested by the prior of record, was unsupported by objective factual evidence and was not found to be substantial evidentiary value. The examiner has provided in the last office action, a convincing one of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the cited references. Applicants are reminded that 37 CFR 1.111(b) states, a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Therefore, the applicants have failed to provided *prima facie* evidence how the language of the claims patentably distinguished them from the cited references. Hence, the applicants' assertions are just mere allegation with no supported fact.



THE 12/05/06